

~~SECRET~~

24 April 1957

Approved For Release 2001/03/04 : CIA-RDP80-01826R000800050017-5
THE CIA CAREER COUNCIL

Directed Assignments

25X1A 1. In 1954 the Director established the policy that membership in the Career Staff was conditional on the acceptance by the individual of the obligations and conditions of duty in CIA. This policy was reemphasized by him in Notice [redacted] 7 December 1956, in which he states that "we cannot carry on our work with maximum effectiveness through a wholly voluntary assignment system and that all personnel responsible for administering our Career Service program have very great responsibility in directing the assignment of personnel."

2. Heads of Career Services have utilized the directed assignment policy with varying degrees of success. Some of the policies and procedures are described below.

a. The Deputy Director (Support) has approved a procedure by which employees in his area may be selected for duty at posts abroad where conditions do not permit dependents to accompany the employee. No commitments are made to the individual that he will receive special consideration for future assignments or special benefits. However, when an individual is selected for a directed assignment and performs well on the job, this will be taken into consideration in competitive evaluation for promotion. Such a person would not normally be selected for another assignment of a hardship nature except in cases of extreme need or emergency.

b. The Clandestine Services Career Service Board is empowered to direct the assignments of members of the CS/CS. Individual cases are referred to the Board following consideration by the appropriate panel. As a matter of policy, a decision to make a directed assignment is based upon a consideration of the needs of the Clandestine Services as well as on any circumstances affecting the employee and his family which would have a bearing on the suitability of the assignment. The question of an employee's "consent" is not directly involved in arriving at such a decision. An employee who refuses to follow a course of action which has been determined to be in the Agency's interest, is subject to disciplinary action, including dismissal. (See Case C)

c. Directed assignments made on the basis of the needs of the Service and the circumstances involved in each individual case have been made in the Career Services of DD/I (see Cases D and E), in the Communications Career Service (see Case A) and in the Logistics Career Service (see Case B).

3. A review of current cases shows that directed assignments by Heads of Career Services and by the Deputies of the three major components are now being made along similar lines. It is important that a uniform and equitable policy be standardized as much as possible, taking into consideration the particular problems and needs of the different Services. However, the policy of directing assignments is put across far better by implementation than by writing policy. It is recommended that the Deputy Directors continue to exercise their assignment authority along the same lines which they are now following and that such assignments only be made by Heads of Career Services and then only with the concurrence of the Deputy Director concerned.

4. There are attached brief summaries of cases which illustrate the problems of directed assignments.

Approved For Release 2001/03/04 : CIA-RDP80-01826R000800050017-5

STATSPEC

C/NA, D/LO, A/C/R, C/TSS

25X1A6a
25X1A6a
CASE A (COMMO): In October 1956 subject, married with two children, GS-8, member of the Career Staff, was assigned to [REDACTED]. He accepted with a departure date of January 1957. In December 1956, subject stated he no longer wanted the assignment and he did not want to take his family into this area because of the political upheaval. The Commo Career Service had determined that subject was the best qualified for this assignment and that his reasons for declining were inadequate. On 3 April 1957, the Director of Communications requested that subject be either terminated or reassigned.

CASE B (LOGISTICS): In March 1956 subject, married with no children, GS-11, member of the Career Staff, was selected for an overseas assignment which he declined to accept since his mother was ill and aged. The Logistics Career Board considered subject's reasons and accepted them on compassionate grounds. In March 1957 subject was requested to accept an assignment at [REDACTED]. He declined on the premise that such assignment would "thwart my primary intention, viz., of seeking employment outside of Logistics." Efforts to locate a suitable reassignment for subject had been unsuccessful and he had been so notified. In April 1957, the Director of Logistics requested that subject be separated.

CASE C (TSS/DDP): Subject, single, WB \$3.72 per hour, member of the Career Staff, was determined by the TSS Panel to be a suitable candidate for an overseas assignment. He had said in 1952 that he would go overseas if required and in 1954 said he would not accept an overseas assignment for reasons that were personal. When subject refused the assignment because he was unwilling to go overseas, the case was referred to the CS/CS Board. The decision was made that subject either accept the assignment or submit his resignation. Subject has resigned effective 1 July 1957.

FOIAb3b

CASE D [REDACTED]: Subject, an informational specialist, single, GS-11, member of the Career Staff, consistently refused assignments overseas or in the [REDACTED] without giving justifiable reasons. She was told that her only alternative was to seek employment elsewhere in the Agency. Her file was "shopped" without success. Anticipating a position outside of the Agency she requested retention in her present position until the end of the year. This position did not materialize. In April 1957 she was offered the alternative of taking a position in [REDACTED] or resigning. She has submitted her resignation, effective 1 August 1957.

CASE E (OCR): Subject, GS-7, single, member of the Career Staff, was assigned a position in an OCR Branch Library in February 1957. After she announced that she could not do the work because there was too much physical activity, the workload was lightened. She then stated the job was too dull and asked to do the whole job. During this time she had a request in for reassignment. About 17 April she stated to her supervisor that the job was too much for her and walked off the job. She was told to report to the Office of Personnel under charges of abandonment of position. There she was informed that unless she could not physically perform the duties, supported by a certificate from her physician, or submit to a CIA physical examination, that she would have to remain on the current job until reassignment efforts were successful. She then announced that she would return to her job, apologized to her supervisor and stated she would try hard to perform the job as required.